

**Community Conservation Assistance Program Advisory Committee Meeting
November 16th, 2011: Archdale Building, 5th Floor Conference Room**



Attendees: Bonnie Bendell (Division of Coastal Management), Alaina Bloodworth (NRCS), Tim Kennedy (DSWC), Mike Doxey (District Employees Association), Wayne Howell (NC Association of RC&Ds), Shelly Baird (DSWC), Julie Henshaw (DSWC)

Teleconference: David Ledford (Lincoln SWCD), Mike Dupree (Durham SWCD)

I. Introductions

Julie Henshaw opened the meeting and introductions were made by attendees.

II. Review and Approval of July 28, 2011 Minutes

By consensus, the minutes of the April meeting were approved.

III. NCASWCD Update

Shelly Baird gave a brief update on the NCASWCD Community Conservation Committee. This Committee was scheduled to meet at the NCASWCD Annual Meeting in January. Topics included annual action items, along with presentations from NC Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services on the Sustainable Local Food Advisory Committee and the Departments support of community conservation efforts. The 1st annual Jim Stephenson Community Conservation award will be presented. In addition, an Urban District Caucus will be held. Updates will be provided at the March CCAP Advisory Committee meeting.

IV. Program Policies Discussion

A. Determine eligibility of sites based on the release from sediment and erosion control plan (Lincoln SWCD)

The CCAP policy currently states that a property must have been developed for at least three year and released from its sediment and erosion control permit. There is a site in Lincoln county that is experiencing severe erosion, but due to change in ownership and lack of developer responsibility, the individuals on either side of the property in question are in need of cost share assistance to try and fix the problem. There was a lengthy discussion to determine if this was eligible since it has not been released from its S&E control permit. The Committee is recommending to keep the CCAP policy as is, but allow Lincoln SWCD to request a one-time exception to policy from the Soil and Water Conservation Commission. It was agreed that efforts should be made to try and alleviate this erosion problem.

B. Further clarification on program eligibility based on the definition of agriculture (educational greenhouse example)

The current CCAP policy states that the source of the structure or site causing the problem determines eligibility for CCAP. If the source of the water quality problem is agriculture, it is not eligible for CCAP. There have been several projects to install cisterns on greenhouses at school sites. Greenhouses are considered agriculture under the existing definition. The

committee discussed the benefits of installing cisterns at schools and proposed an exception to allow cisterns on greenhouses at educational entities only.

C. Requirements common to all practices revisions: Downstream treatment

Mike Dupree (Durham SWCD) proposed the following question to the committee: If there is downstream treatment, is CCAP eligible to treat the problem on site? Lengthy discussion was had and the committee felt that CCAP should be eligible even if there was existing downstream treatment. There is currently no policy prohibiting this. Committee thoughts included that addressing the problem on site is better than moving it downstream and if a major erosion issue is present, this trumps the fact that there is downstream treatment. Mr. Dupree agreed and further explained that some neighborhood-wide treatment BMPs are only designed to treat atmospheric deposition and if a landowner installs fertilizers, BMPs designed to remove nutrients are required. It was suggested to possibly add language to the CCAP BMP checklists to clarify these issues.

D. Job Approval Authority: Registered Landscape Architects and Contractors

David Ledford (Lincoln SWCD) requested that Registered Landscape Architects (RLAs) be considered for receiving job approval authority (JAA) in CCAP. He referenced that DWQ allows RLA's designs for stormwater BMPs. Shelly Baird agreed to meet with DWQ to get more information and will report at the March CAC meeting. In addition, Mike Dupree (Durham SWCD) requested consideration of Irrigation Contractors receiving JAA for cistern design. This discussion will continue at the next meeting.

E. Cistern policy revision

1. Connected vs. disconnected – system approach vs. singular cistern

The committee discussed the question of connecting or disconnecting cisterns and the eligibility of cost-sharing more than one accessories package, as well as criteria for PE approval. The committee recommended the following:

- a. If a site requires the installation of more than one cistern tank, the tanks should be connected.
- b. If two or more cisterns are connected, only one accessories package, including a pump, will be eligible for cost share. A written justification must be provided if cistern tanks are not connected. If two or more cistern tanks are disconnected, cost share may be eligible for an accessories package per individual tank.
- c. Design approval will be based on the total size of the system. Regardless of if the cistern tanks or connected or not, if the total size of the cistern system is over 3,000 gallons, design approval by a Professional Engineer is required.

F. Streambank / shoreline protection, stream restoration, and marsh sills average cost list

1. Permits as a cost-shareable component

The committee discussed allowing permit fees to be cost-shared through CCAP and recommended to not allow permit fees for these practices, due to limited funding.

V. Design Manual: rain garden and bioretention differentiation

Guidance is needed to clarify when a site requires a bioretention design over a rain garden. This item was tabled until information can be gathered from DWQ and NCSU.

Next Meeting: March 9, 2012 (9:30am – noon), Archdale building